

△ NEWSLETTER △

D I V I S I O N O F C L I N I C A L A N D A B N O R M A L P S Y C H O L O G Y

October 1952

Vol. VI No. 1

Editors: O. Hobart Mowrer
Ann Magaret

MESSAGE FROM THE NEW PRESIDENT

As a member of the Executive Committee last year and this, I have been repeatedly impressed by the energy, devotion, and wisdom which members characteristically display in meeting their obligations on committees and as officers of this Division. The results of such efficiency and good judgment are easily observed: The Division is big and still growing, it is healthy and prosperous, and it is respected and trusted by the rest of the Association. I have every confidence that the Division will continue in its present role of sound accomplishment and leadership.

There is reason for believing, nevertheless, that the activities and functions of this Division may now be in a state of transition. Immediately after World War II, a number of new social and professional demands descended upon psychologists; and Division 12 was the logical and, in some instances, the only part of the APA which was prepared to take an active role in meeting these challenges. However, many of these activities and functions are now being taken over by newly created APA boards and committees, by the Central Office, or by the State Psychological Association. This trend is both natural and desirable. But it creates a problem of which we need to be fully aware, if the Division is to re-adjust sensibly and gracefully to these changing circumstances.

One way to summarize the situation is to say that in the years immediately ahead Division 12 will probably become relatively more of an "interest" group and less of an "action" group. Many members will welcome this. Certainly it should afford greater opportunity for intensive work upon the many theoretical and technical problems that confront us. But at the same time we should not think of the Division as wholly abandoning its concern with the more strictly professional type of issue. The point is that our concerns on this score will need to be expressed and implemented somewhat differently. We shall need, particularly, to develop direct and effective means of communication with those parts of the Association which will be carrying on enterprises of greatest importance to us. We shall want, of course, to keep certain of our present special committees for the time being and, as the occasion requires, create others; but as soon as special machinery has been set up either at the national or local level for dealing with our problems, we shall want to make full use of such facilities and to keep in close contact with their operation.

To this end, it has already become an established practice, as of the Washington meeting, for our Representatives on the Council to report, at the annual business meeting of the Division, Council actions, past or pending, which have special bearing upon Division activities and objectives. Moreover, it is hoped that certain changes can be made in convention programming this year so that next fall, at Michigan State College, this process of interaction between divisions, on the one hand, and the governing bodies and committees of the Association, on the other, will be considerably facilitated.

The Board of Directors and the Council of Representatives are both concerned with the desires and needs of divisions, as well as with over-all APA policy and operation; but divisions must see to it that their desires and needs are effectively communicated; and it is equally important that the divisions also have an opportunity to know about and to participate in discussion of the more general type of problems which the APA handles.

My hope, then, is that members of Division 12 will keep in touch with their officers and committees, both directly and through the medium of the Newsletter; follow APA affairs as closely as possible through the American Psychologist and other channels; take an active part in Division nominations and elections; and attend and participate in the Division's annual business meetings. If we can do these things, the Division will continue to play an influential and constructive role in the advancement of American psychology, even though the way in which we do this becomes somewhat altered.

O. Hobart Mowrer

DIVISIONAL ACTIVITIES AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

At the recent APA convention in Washington, both the outgoing and incoming Executive Committees of the Division held lengthy meetings. The Annual Meeting of the Division was also held at this time. The minutes of these three meetings follow:

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OUTGOING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Executive Committee members present: Beck, Harris, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holt, Macfarlane, Magaret, Mowrer, Rotter; Committee chairmen or representatives present: Bernreuter, Cofer, Ellis, Klebanoff, McNeill, Watson, Young.

The committee spent the bulk of its time discussing the reports of the various Divisional committees. Most of these reports have been published in the August, 1952, Newsletter.

The report of the PROGRAM COMMITTEE was considered first, and action taken to establish a portfolio of procedures for that committee. There was some discussion regarding the time allotment which is made to Division 12 on the APA program; some members felt that, in view of its size, this Division should be allotted more time. Dr. Mowrer pointed out that the Program Committee had been able to fill the Division's time with papers of high quality, and stated that he felt that the time allotted the Division was not too brief.

There was considerable discussion regarding the work of the PSYCHOTHERAPY COMMITTEE, which is in the process of collecting samples of verbatim therapeutic sessions, which may be duplicated and distributed for teaching and research purposes. Dr. Young pointed out that his committee had invited both brief and lengthy protocols from cooperating therapists, and that it now had found a number of sources from which to obtain records. The Executive Committee discussed both the cost and the philosophy of such a project, while agreeing that the project is an important and desirable one.

Dr. McNeill reporting for the LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, pointed out some of the difficulties his committee had faced in obtaining information on legislation which was comparable from state to state. There was some discussion regarding the recent increase in activities related to legislation on the part of various APA groups: The Board of Directors, the APA Legislation Committee, and the Conference on State Psychological Associations. The Divisional Committee on Legislation had been organized at a time when the APA was less active in legislative affairs, and may have stimulated the national groups to become more concerned with legislation. In view of these recent developments, Dr. McNeill recommended that his committee be discharged, and his recommendation was accepted by the Executive Committee. It was understood that, so long as the APA continued to work actively in this area, the Division sees no need for such a committee, but the Division will remain vigilant and be prepared to undertake the functions of the Legislation Committee again whenever the need should arise.

In connection with Dr. Ellis' report for the COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE PRACTICE, there was some discussion regarding the suggestion that the APA voice its disapproval of legislation in the various states which might be restrictive to legitimate activities of psychologists. Dr. Ellis pointed out that the proposal of his committee was aimed at encouraging the APA to voice its support of the efforts of state psychological groups to obtain adequate legislation. Dr. Ellis also brought to the attention of the Executive Committee the set of standards for unsupervised private practice which his committee had proposed, and asked for some action on these standards. There was a lengthy discussion of the machinery by which a Division might bring pressure to enforce standards of training and experience required of its members who are engaged in unsupervised practice. It was decided to communicate the report of the Committee on Private Practice to the AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST for publication, since this is a problem of interest to many members of the association.

Dr. Klebanoff reported for the committee on TEACHING CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY. In addition to the report published earlier, Dr. Klebanoff presented a summary of the results of the questionnaire study conducted by this committee (see page 13). It was suggested that perhaps the Division would like to sponsor a fixed symposium on problems of teaching clinical psychology at the annual meetings each year.

The report of the committee on REGIONAL MEETINGS was presented by Dr. Cofer. Discussion of this report centered on the question of what needs were felt by Divisional members which were not being met by the various regional psychological groups. It was felt that a Divisional Committee on Regional Meetings served two sorts of needs: (1) obtaining sufficient representation of relevant papers on the Programs of regional meetings; and (2) helping Divisional members in the various regions to feel affiliated with the Division as a unit. Dr. Macfarlane reported that the committee had served a real function on the West Coast, in providing opportunity for West Coast members to discuss a variety of Divisional issues.

Dr. Holt presented a supplementary report of the committee on PUBLICATION OUTLETS (to be published in a future Newsletter). Many of the conclusions of this report constitute recommendations to the APA Publications Board. After considerable discussion of the policies of APA journals, it was decided to transmit to the APA Council a resolution that if it becomes necessary to increase the revenues of APA publications, such action should not be carried out by charging authors of publications more, if other means can be found.

Dr. Bernreuter, representing the AUDITING COMMITTEE, reported that the books of the Division had been audited and found in good order. On the motion of Dr. Magaret, the Executive Committee voted to accept the 1952-53 budget as published in the August, 1952, Newsletter.

There followed a long discussion of post-doctoral training, stimulated by Dr. Watson's report for the SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST DOCTORAL TRAINING INSTITUTES. It was moved that this committee be advised that the stipulation that the Institute be self-sustaining is interpreted to mean that the conferences must pay their way over a period of several years. If necessary for good programming, a modest deficit may be incurred for any one year. The motion was seconded and carried. The whole matter of the Division's undertaking educational activities was then discussed in some detail. Some members of the Executive Committee suggested that various Universities are better equipped to handle the details of arranging the Institutes than is a Divisional Committee. Because of the questions which arose in the course of the discussion, it was decided to bring the entire matter of post-doctoral training before the membership at the Annual Meeting (see page 5). In this connection, the following motions were made, seconded and carried: (1) that the Post-Doctoral Institute be continued for another year; (2) that all aspects of the problem of continuing the Institute and of the administrative difficulties which are involved be explored; and (3) that the possible discontinuation of the Institute should be discussed at the next Annual Meeting.

The report of the committee on NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS was read by the Secretary. It was the feeling of the Executive Committee that, despite its faults, the present system of obtaining nominations is democratic, and no changes are contemplated for the coming year.

The report of the SUBCOMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP STANDARDS was read by Dr. Macfarlane. It was moved, seconded and carried that action on this report be deferred until the report can be published in the Newsletter and studied by the membership. (This report is to be found on Page 9 of this Newsletter. Comments on the report are invited. Send your comments to Dr. Ann Magaret, 5728 Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois.)

The meeting was adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE DIVISION

The meeting was called to order by President Beck. Dr. Howard White, reporting for the MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE, read the names of applicants for Fellowship and Associateship in the Division who had been approved by the Membership Committee and by the Executive Committee. The following applicants for Fellowship status were then approved also by a vote of the membership at the Annual Meeting: (This vote constitutes only a recommendation to the APA Board of Directors. Nomination for election is then made to the Council of Representatives.)

Abt, Lawrence Edwin	Cruickshank, William M.	Pathman, Julian H.
Bellak, Leopold	Ellis, Albert	Pellettieri, A. J.
Brick, Maria	Kelley, Ida B.	Sells, Saul B.
Brown, Fred	LeCraft, Beatrice	Vernier, Claire Myers
Combs, Arthur	Napoli, Peter J.	Wolf, Elizabeth Baker

By a vote of the membership, the following persons were then elected to Associate status in the Division:

Angrilli, Albert	Drummond, William A. Jr.	Landward, John M.
Aronson, Marvin L.	Eichler, Robert M.	Iasovik, Aaron David
Avakian, Sonia A.	Finn, M. H. P.	Lazarus, Richard S.
Axelrad, Sidney	Glad, Donald D.	Leibman, O. Bernard
Barahal, George D.	Goodstein, Leonard D.	Levine, Solomon
Barrell, Robert P.	Goolishian, Harold A.	Lewis, Benjamin G.
Beier, Ernst G.	Graham, E. Ellis	Lindner, Harold
Bell, Richard Q.	Graves, Winifred	Lotsoff, Erwin
Bensberg, Gerard J. Jr.	Gundlach, Ralph H.	Mark, Joseph C.
Berenberg, Albert N.	Hanvik, Leo Joseph	Martire, John G.
Beverly, Louise M.	Harway, Norman I.	Mason, Charles F.
Blum, Lucille	Harway, Vivian I.	Mathias, Rudolf
Brody, A. B.	Headlee, Raymond	Mc Farland, Frances W.
Brody, Benjamin	Henrikson, Lars V.	Mc Farland, Robert L.
Brown, Gladys G.	Holzman, Philip S.	Mc Gaughran, Laurence S.
Burnham, Catherine A.	Jahoda, Hedwig	Mc Govern, J. D.
Carpenter, Lewis G.	Jeffreys, A. W. Jr.	Mc Laughlin, E. J.
Cohen, Jacob	Johnson, Elizabeth Z.	Meltzoff, Julian
Cohen, Ellen	Kahn, Marvin W.	Melker, Felice H.
Dailey, Charles A.	Karson, Samuel	Michelson, Barbara
Daly, William C.	Katz, Joseph	Miller, Roy
Deutsche, Jean Marquis	Katz, Melvyn M.	Munn, Seth W.
DeVos, George A.	Kerner, Oliver J. E.	Nass, Martin Leo
Divney, Herbert P.	Krasno, Isadore	Nechin, Herbert

Pearl, David
Pearson, John S.
Pope, Benjamin
Price, Frampton
Ray, Harriet P.
Rigby, W. K.
Romano, Edith
Roseman, Morris
Rosen, Ephraim
Rubinstein, Eli A.
Rusalew, Herbert
Sanddal, James

Santora, Dante A.
Schnadt, Frederick W.
Senf, Rita
Siegel, Edward L.
Shimberg, Edmund
Silliker, Hazel
Singer, H. S.
Skoor, Emanuel
Stafford, Elizabeth Downs
Steinberg, Arthur
Stormont-Seymour, Charlyne T.
Sutker, Alvin R.

Thetford, William N.
Toobert, Saul
Trippe, Matthew J.
Underberg, Rita P.
Vayhinger, John M.
Walcott, William O.
Waxenberg, Sheldon
Whalley, Sherman L.
Yudin, Sidney
Zemlich, Maurice

All Divisional committee reports which had previously been published in the Newsletter were presented by title, and discussion from the floor invited. Discussion centered mainly around the reports of two committees: the Subcommittee on the Post-doctoral Institutes and the Committee on Legislation.

The report of the SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE POST DOCTORAL INSTITUTE was reviewed by Dr. Watson, and an additional report, prepared by members attending the 1952 Institute, was read by Dr. Charles Ullmann. Dr. Newland, chairman of the COMMITTEE ON POST DOCTORAL TRAINING, reviewed the report of his committee for the membership, pointing out that the function of this committee had been largely that of studying opportunities for post-doctoral training now available.

In the general discussion from the floor which followed, a number of points concerning both the philosophy of post-doctoral training and the machinery for implementing Divisional post-doctoral institutes were brought up. Dr. Lowell Kelly reported that the APA Education and Training Board has a new Post-Doctoral Committee, created largely out of the experience of the Post-Doctoral Committee of Division 12. Dr. Mowrer pointed out that with the establishment of this new APA committee, many of the functions carried out by the Divisional Post-Doctoral Committee could be transferred to the Education and Training Board. The actual planning of post-doctoral institutes for the Division, however, could remain in the hands of a Divisional committee.

It was clear from the general discussion that members of the Division feel a need for post-doctoral institutes as the Division has been conducting them, and that such institutes can probably be sponsored by the Division without financial difficulties. There was some difference of opinion regarding the intensiveness and length of the institutes, with some members feeling that the more lengthy post-doctoral training programs sponsored by post-graduate centers would be more profitable, and others feeling that the function of the Divisional institutes was to provide a brief opportunity for keeping up with advances in the various fields represented. The members were reminded that the Divisional institutes had originally been planned as demonstration projects, with the hope that other organizations would decide to sponsor similar institutes. It was felt by some that the Division has an opportunity to provide sorts of learning experiences different from those sponsored by the larger postgraduate centers. Dr. Newland summarized the discussion and suggested that (1) the incoming Executive Committee consider the possibility of transferring to the Education and training Board the work which the Divisional Committee on Post Doctoral Training has been doing; and (2) that the Divisional Post-Doctoral Institutes be continued with the same structure as it has had for the past three years.

Dr. McNeill, reporting for the LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, discussed the decision of the outgoing Executive Committee to discharge this committee. His committee feels that it has served an interim function at a time when the APA was not particularly active in matters of legislation. When the APA Board of Directors and the various State Psychological Societies became interested in legislation, and machinery was developed to handle legislative matters, then the Divisional Legislation Committee decided to request that it be discharged, so that more general APA agencies could continue this work.

The Secretary read the report of the COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS, and announced the following results of the election:

President-elect:	William A. Hunt
Divisional Representative to the APA Council:	Ruth Tolman
	Joseph Zubin
Member-at-large of the Executive Committee:	James G. Miller

The budget as printed in the August, 1952, Newsletter was approved by the membership.

In line with the amendments to the By-Laws adopted this year, the Secretary then reviewed those issues being considered by the APA Council of Representatives which are of special interest to Division 12:

(1) The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Relations with the Medical Profession, published in the May 1952 issues of the AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST was reviewed first. Discussion in the Council centered around the question of private or unsupervised practice. The Council referred this report back to the Committee for further work, particularly on the parts devoted to private practice. In discussing this topic, Dr. Kelly again invited the membership to communicate with him regarding the report, if there are comments or suggestions for change.

(2) The question of legislation for psychologists was discussed at some length in the Council, but no official policy concerning the type of legislation which might be supported was adopted. The editor of the AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGIST has been directed to publish a symposium of viewpoints regarding legislation in this journal, representing as many different attitudes toward the various issues as possible.

(3) The APA Committee on Ethics has now presented its completed code of ethics. There will now be a three-year trial period for the code before any formal action on its adoption is taken by the Council.

(4) The Council is considering changes in procedures for membership in the APA. A proposal has been made that the APA publish to the membership, well in advance of their election to Fellowship, the names of applicants for Fellowship status in the APA. (This is in line with the procedure employed by Division 12 for some years.) Considerable discussion from the floor ensued, centering largely around the time factor. The Council proposal involves publication of names of applicants one year in advance of their election. Some Division members felt this plan would necessitate cutting down the experience requirement for Divisional membership, while others felt that this difficulty could be handled within the present Divisional membership standards. It was pointed out that the Council proposal involves two issues which should be considered separately by the Division: (a) the question of whether the Council should be encouraged to publish the names of applicants; and (b) the time at which a Division nominates to the Council an individual applying for Fellowship.

Dr. Mowrer, as chairman of the APA Committee on Malpractice Insurance, reported briefly to the membership on the activities of his committee, stressing particularly the need which many psychologists feel for insurance of this sort.

The meeting was then opened for new business. Dr. Kelly suggested that the Division might wish to make a contribution to the fund being raised for the new APA building. After some discussion it was moved, seconded and carried that the division contribute up to \$500, subject to the action of the incoming Executive Committee. A second motion to the effect that this Divisional contribution is merely a token one, and not intended to discharge the obligations of individual members to the building fund, was also carried.

Dr. Beck then introduced the new President, Dr. Mowrer. The meeting was then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE INCOMING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(Present: Harris, Hobbs, Holt, Hunt, Macfarlane, Magaret, Mowrer, Miller, Symonds, Tolman, Zubin.

The meeting was called to order by President Mowrer. The first order of business was a review of the committee structure of the Division. The work of each committee was reviewed, and discussion carried out regarding the independent or overlapping functions of the committee. The following actions were taken:

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY: In view of the fact that the APA Education and Training Board is considering many of the problems formerly handled by this Committee, there was some question as to whether the committee should be continued. It was decided that the Divisional committee should continue for one year, and then be asked to advise the Executive Committee as to whether it still has a role, in the light of the developing E & T Board.

COMMITTEE ON PSYCHOTHERAPY: It was decided to continue the work of this committee for another year.

COMMITTEE ON INTERPROFESSIONAL RELATIONS: In view of the liaison between this and the Ad Hoc Committee, it was decided to continue this committee.

POST DOCTORAL TRAINING COMMITTEE: Taking into consideration the discussion at the Annual Meeting, and the activities of the E&T Board in the area of Post Doctoral Training, it was decided to discontinue this committee.

(SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST-DOCTORAL CONFERENCE: Dr. Ullmann's report of the 1952 Conference was carefully considered by the Executive Committee. It was decided that the former subcommittee on conference be retitled the COMMITTEE ON POST DOCTORAL INSTITUTES, and that it should be continued for another year.

COMMITTEE ON DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES: It was pointed out that there is a general APA Committee which is considering many of the problems which might come before this Divisional committee. Since the Divisional committee is still in the process of collecting data for its survey, the Executive Committee voted to continue the committee for another year, and to ask this committee to advise the Executive Committee concerning its continuing functions after this year.

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS: The secretary was directed to enclose a stamped, self-addressed envelope with each copy of the nominations ballots next year, and to analyze the responses received by geographical location. It was decided to make no alteration in the procedure for obtaining nominations next year.

Dr. Mowrer presented a plan for rescheduling the various business meetings conducted during the APA convention, with a view to involving members of the division more thoroughly in the APA affairs. Two motions were made, seconded and carried in this connection: (1) that the Executive Committee request the APA Program Committee to adopt the plan of convention scheduling presented by Dr. Mowrer; and (2) that the time of the annual APA conventions be divided so that there is little or no overlapping between the business and professional aspects of the convention.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION OUTLETS: This committee's recommendation that it be discontinued with the presentation of its most recent report was adopted by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee also adopted a resolution to the Publication Board of the APA to the effect that increasing costs of publication to authors should be ranked at the bottom of the list of possible methods of increasing Publication Board income.

COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL MEETINGS: It was decided that this committee continue its functioning.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE PRACTICE: It was decided that this committee continue its function.

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION: This committee was discontinued by action of the outgoing Executive Committee.

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH: There was considerable discussion regarding the place of research in the Division, and the function of a research committee. The Executive Committee voted to continue this committee, with the proviso that it be made up of persons in the same geographical area, and that it maintain close contact with the Divisional Program Committee.

COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS: This committee, created by the Outgoing Executive Committee at its midyear meeting, was discussed in some detail, with the help of Dr. Percival Symonds, the chairman of this new committee. Dr. Symonds presented three suggestions for activities of this committee: (1) to explore interests of the membership in forming special interest groups (2) to take whatever preliminary steps seem reasonable in drawing up plans for the formation of one or more interest groups for which interest is expressed; and (3) to make proposals to the Division at its 1953 meeting with regard to the formation of special interest groups and how they should be set up within the divisional organization. The Executive Committee unanimously accepted Dr. Symonds' plans for the work of the committee.

Dr. Miller raised the question of reactivating the earlier Divisional COMMITTEE ON EXAMINATIONS. There was some discussion as to the feasibility of building a pool of examination questions in the field of clinical psychology. The matter was finally referred to the Committee on Teaching Clinical Psychology.

Considerable time was then devoted to the appointment of members to the various divisional committees. It was decided that the chairman of each committee be told in advance the members of his committee, and be invited to make changes or additions to the membership. (Names of 1952-53 committees will be published in the Newsletter as soon as the rolls are complete.)

The Executive Committee voted to pledge \$500 from Divisional funds to the APA Building Fund, the time of paying the pledge being left to the discretion of the Secretary-Treasurer. The meeting was then adjourned.

3. An informal discussion group of members of Division 12 was held for the first time in connection with the APA meetings. About 15 Divisional members attended, along with officers and committee chairmen of the Division. A number of Divisional issues were discussed, including the question of post-doctoral training, malpractice insurance, and the interpretations of the newly-developed APA code of ethics for psychologists. It was felt that such discussion groups might be tried again at future APA meetings.

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP

The following report, which reviews the present standards for membership in this Division and suggests some possible changes, is published here to permit members of the Division to study the matter at their leisure, and to comment on it. The committee is particularly anxious to obtain comments and suggestions from the members regarding the whole matter of membership standards and procedures. Send your comments to Dr. Ann Magaret, 5728 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois.

This committee was appointed in response to a number of inquiries relative to the ambiguities of interpretation and implementation of 1) APA by-laws with respect to membership, 2) Division 12 by-laws, 3) procedural standards adopted by the executive committee from time to time.

The committee reviewed APA and divisional by-laws re membership standards, procedural guides in so far as they have been articulated, the questions raised and suggestions made by the last four membership committees chairmaned by Drs. Challman, Young, Wyatt and White, the content of the form letter to sponsors, and the application form filled in by applicants.

We shall limit our report to a discussion of:

1. The philosophies of associate and fellow membership and the present structure of by-laws and procedures with their sources of confusion.
2. The difficulties which membership committees report in making adequate appraisals of applicants under present by-laws and procedural rules.
3. Suggestions for implementing alternate goals in membership selection made partly by the former membership committees and partly by this present committee.

Philosophies of Membership

In the main, three types of membership are possible to a professional organization, one predicated upon common interests, the second upon some standard of professional competence, and the third upon a combination of the two. One year ago the APA as an organization, went on record when by-law changes were instituted not to increase training and experience standards for associate membership. In short, associate membership still rests upon an interest base--and very minimum training and/or experience. For Fellowship status the APA retained the interest base plus the Ph.D. plus five years of "presumed" competence (research or acceptable professional experience).

When competence as a criterion enters the picture as it does by both APA and Division 12 by-laws, procedural problems of appraisal immediately arise. Unless procedural rules are spelled out, appraisals vary with each membership committee. In part they have been spelled out but not adequately to insure equity. Below are some of the questions raised by membership committee members during the last four years.

What is clinical experience of which the Fellow must have five post-doctoral years at a level of presumed competence? Is it experience only in a medical setting, or largely and what is largely, or is any of it in a medical setting, or is counselling of normals also to be considered clinical experience? And must it include psychodiagnostics using objective and projective tests, case synthesis and psychotherapy or is psychodiagnostics alone sufficient or psychotherapy alone sufficient? Can it be partly teaching practicum courses? Or lecture courses? Can any of it be research in the field or in an allied field? Can it be combinations of clinical face-to-face practice, teaching, supervision of clinical students and research, and if so should there be a minimum prescribed amounts of each, all or any? Do we require breadth of experience or is specialization without breadth adequate, e. g., speech work or remedial reading? From the different membership committees

come different interpretations of what clinical experience is.

What is presumed competence and how do we appraise it? The questions and doubts here are even larger than those defining clinical experience and the most basic question is, "Can we appraise competence without elaborate machinery and great cost?" Are we trying in the procedural guides we now have to do what ABEPP is designed to do and we can't possibly do without investigations, examinations, etc.? Have we, worried about incompetents in the field, tried to take on a competence appraisal job that we haven't the funds or machinery to carry through? Should we scrap our whole attempt to appraise competence or can we work out rough screening through more detailed and more specified application blanks and more detailed sponsor letters to do enough to satisfy our needs to eliminate the sub-marginal people, or should we take them in hoping that membership will improve their standards? Or are we satisfied to put the load on the membership committee, as we now do, knowing that the combined judgment of five people is as good (although variable) as we could possibly do in a fluid field since we have the safeguard of a published list of prospective candidates before the executive committee and the Council of Representatives act?

The committee proposes that the executive committee decide whether it wishes to have membership stand:

1. upon an interest basis with no appraisal of competence and let five years of any type of professional psychological practice (clinical, research or teaching) qualify the candidate provided his sponsors approve his personal character, integrity and maturity of judgment. If this is the chosen alternative, by-law changes must be introduced and adopted.
2. upon some appraisal of competence. This could be continued on our present basis with its ambiguities or more adequately perhaps if more detailed information were secured a) from the candidate upon his training (a transcript of record might well be requested at the Associate level) upon the nature and variety of his clinical experience and/or his research and teaching experience, and b) more detailed information from sponsors who know in detail the nature and quality of his basic training and his post-doctoral clinical practice, teaching and/or research.
3. upon a more intensive and more adequate appraisal such as ABEPP or the state licensing boards might make. (This last would require sizeable costs and would duplicate the work of ABEPP and state licensing boards. It would, in this sense, really make Division 12 a certifying agency.)

This committee suggests the second alternative, at least until such time as state certifying or licensing boards become nationwide. In implementation of this second alternative, the committee, later in this report, will make procedural suggestions which it believes would make the membership committee's task less ambiguous and less trying.

The executive committee should make a more definitive decision as to what type of experience is to be accepted as qualifying. There are several alternatives:

1. Five years of face-to-face clinical practice, part of which must be institutional experience where collaboration with other professionals exists and where the benefits of more experienced personnel is available.
2. The five years may be defined as a considerable bulk of clinical face-to-face experience, e.g., three years part of which should be in a medical

setting, the other two years might be in graduate teaching or research.

3. All of it could be isolated clinical practice.

4. All of it could be teaching or research.

It is obvious that the definition of qualifying experience will determine the nature of Division 12. If all of it were face-to-face clinical practice, Division 12 would have a different type of membership than if all of it could be teaching and research, which in turn would be different if combinations of face-to-face practice and research or teaching are included as qualifying experience.

The committee recommends some such defining of qualifying experience as the following:

Five years post-doctoral experience to be made up of the following:

- a) A minimum of ²three years, * or its accumulated equivalent, of clinical practice, one year of which should be in a medical setting where collaboration and supervision are available from more experienced practitioners, the other two years of which may be clinical experience in a vocational, counseling center or department in which professional responsibility to patient or clients with emotional problems has been met by the candidate.
- b) Two of the five years may be from all or any combination of the following:
 - 1) Clinical, child development, or personality research.
 - 2) Teaching of graduate clinical courses where indirectly the applicant has been in contact with case materials and test results of normals with scholastic or emotional problems or patients with more acute problems.
 - 3) Supervision of clinical work of students in field installations.
- c) One of the five years may be from ^{isolated}isolated practice only if the applicant has first satisfied the requirement under (a) above. In short, isolated practice alone offers little or no opportunity for sponsor to judge the caliber of the applicant's work.

If we decide upon a block of clinical practice, part of it institutional, and combinations of research and teaching the defining elements of professional practice, the applicant should secure sponsors (two or more) who know of each of these aspects.

If we are still to attempt some measure of appraisal as the committee suggests, it must be limited to the information from the applicant and sponsors and from comments after the list of applicants is published in the Newsletter. This involves, if we are also to include teaching and research as well as continue obtaining information on face-to-face clinical experience and evidence of adequate supervision in the early years of post-doctoral experience,

* A year of clinical experience is defined as 11 full-time months, or its accumulated equivalent.

A year of research is defined as 11 months.

A year of teaching is defined as two semesters or three quarters.

- a) a modification of letters to sponsors. Through separate and more specific letters to sponsors of associates and fellows re training and qualifying experience in clinical practice in clinical teaching and supervision and in relevant qualifying research.
- b) a modification of letters to applicants acquainting them with details of qualifying training and experience and the need of sponsors, two or more, who know enough adequately to appraise the varieties of qualifying experience -- clinical, teaching, research -- they are offering.
- c) a modification of the application blank to include:
 - 1) a transcript of record on formal training
 - 2) a grid which will show the amount and variety of cases they have seen and clinical tools they have used.
 - 3) a descriptive account of professional experience which will give the membership committee adequate data for an appraisal under the following headings:
 - 1. Clinical experience
 - (a) psycho-diagnostics
 - (1) intelligence, special abilities, disabilities and deficits.
 - (2) personality appraisal objective and projective, diagnostic interviews and case synthesis.
 - (b) treatment with brief account of philosophy of treatment and major tools used.
 - 2. Research and publications - Interest, research in progress and publications.
 - 3. Teaching - amount, nature and content (practicum and academic, graduate and undergraduate).
 - 4. Institutional experience and supervision (some modification of item 10 in current application blank.)

The committee believes that in view of the very small number entering the division with a fellowship in abnormal that this fellowship be discontinued, if and when the inclusion of teaching and research experience are adopted.

If a committee is set up to implement the present suggestions in whole or part this committee will turn over, through the Secretary of Division 12, the details of proposed modification of sponsor letters and application forms, as well as suggestions to cover non-Ph.D. candidates.

Respectfully submitted:
 Ann Magaret
 David Shakow
 Jean Walker Macfarlane, Chairman

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

A call for nominations was sent out to the membership through the medium of the divisional Newsletter in January 1952. The response was not encouraging. Out of the divisional membership of 1372 only 212 replies were received. The 389 nominations for Divisional Representatives, 301 for member-at-large and 155 for President contained in these replies were tabulated by the committee chairman, and independently by the divisional secretary, after which the results were transmitted to the Washington office of the Association. The Secretary of the Association communicated with nominees to obtain the pledge to serve if elected, as required by the Association by-laws. The central office of the Association then made up and distributed the official ballots to the Association membership. The

secretary of the division prepared and published biographical material in relation to the nominees running for office in the divisional newsletter, to assist the membership in arriving at voting preferences. As is customary in the Association, the votes were received and tabulated in the Washington office, and the results transmitted to the divisional secretary. These results, as reported by the divisional secretary, are as follows: Divisional president-elect, William A. Hunt; member-at-large, James G. Miller; representatives, Ruth Tolman and Joseph Zubin.

In view of the persisting small membership participation in nominations, the chairman of your committee suggests that the division may wish to review its procedures. The membership participation amounts to so small a fraction of the division that nominations cannot be considered genuinely representative of the division. Under the circumstances, it is possible that the membership may wish to revert to the earlier arrangement by which members actively participating in the affairs of the division are entrusted with the duty of drawing up a slate of candidates and submitting this to the division for its choice of nominees. This procedure has the advantage of allowing a committee on nominations and elections to review the record of active divisional participation, and to select for the consideration of the membership individuals who have already shown willingness and aptitude in relation to divisional responsibility. Such a procedure would be in form less democratic than the prevailing one; but in the opinion of the outgoing chairman of this committee it would not be less democratic in fact. The divisional secretary's office has the records of activity of several score of past and present committee members and other officers which can be made available to a committee on nominations and elections.

It is possible that the membership may wish to adopt some modification of the present procedure to include the suggestions embodied in the foregoing, and at the same time to preserve the present nominally more democratic procedure of inviting general membership participation, in spite of the unsatisfactory character of the response during the past few years. The chairman of your committee recommends earnestly that action be taken to review alternative methods of obtaining nominations which may supersede the existing one.

Henry S. Curtis
Elmer D. Hinckley

Howard F. Hunt
Norman Cameron, Chairman

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT COMMITTEE ON TEACHING CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

The third topic to be studied was the role of the psychiatrist in the psychotherapeutic training of the clinical psychology student. A questionnaire devised by Dr. Leslie Phillips, Chief Psychologist at the Worcester State Hospital was addressed to a large number of training universities and practicum centers. Responses were received from 46 of 71 practicum centers and from 35 of 51 training universities. The following three general topics were studied:

- a. Forms of Psychotherapeutic Training
- b. Problems in the Supervision of Psychology Students in Psychotherapy by Psychiatrists
- c. Attitudes and problems in Communication between Psychology Students and Supervising Psychiatrists.

A. FORMS OF PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC TRAINING:

86% of the universities and 84% of the practicum centers now see to it that their students receive some type of practicum training in psychotherapy. The university tends to stress the counseling and interview type of contact which usually takes place during the first and second years of graduate study. On the other hand, the practicum centers show little interest in these experiences and stress group and individual psychotherapy training. For the most part, these experiences take place during the third and fourth years of graduate study.

B. SUPERVISION BY PSYCHIATRISTS:

90% of the universities responding report that they employ a psychiatrist in their psychotherapy training programs; 85% of the practicum centers utilize a psychiatrist. Although many of the universities are undoubtedly referring to associated practicum centers, the figure remains interesting. The slightly lowered percentage for the practicum facilities is due to their more frequent use of clinical psychologists as therapy supervisors in place of psychiatrists.

The average clinical psychology student tends to receive from 1 to 2 hours of psychiatric supervision per week. In the practicum centers, this tends to take the form of individual case conference with the psychiatrist. In the university, there is more stress on seminar supervision. As a point of interest, the university is more prone to arrange for personal therapy for the student as a form of training than is the practicum center.

An effort was made to evaluate the theoretical orientation of the psychiatric supervision. 56% of the practicum center responses indicated that this took the form of some type of psychoanalytic orientation. In contradistinction, only 39% of the university responses indicated psychoanalytic orientation; the universities revealed much more concern with varying deliberately the orientation.

C. ATTITUDES AND PROBLEMS IN COMMUNICATION:

In general, there is no real problem in communication between representatives of the two disciplines.

With respect to attitudes of psychiatrists toward training non-medical personnel in psychotherapy, the universities report a very harmonious picture. This may be due in part to the fact that the university psychology department can often exercise choice in the selection of a training psychiatrist. However, in the practicum centers, only 55% of the responses reveal a favorable attitude on the part of the psychiatrist as compared with the figure of 79% in the universities. The distribution of negative attitudes ranges from overt hostility toward training non-medical people to more passive or subtle manifestations of reluctance.

Evaluation of the attitudes of the psychology students towards the training psychiatrist reveals that 71% of the university responses are favorable as compared with only 36% of the practicum center responses. Analysis of the sources of irritation reveal the following:

1. Psychiatrists become overly involved with the practical considerations in a case and neglect the theoretical interests of the students.
2. Psychiatrists do not have enough fundamental training in basic psychology and thus are unaware of the theoretical needs of the psychology student.

It should be stated that the above report represents an information gathering effort at analysis of the contribution of the psychiatric discipline to the psychotherapy training of the clinical psychology student. It would appear to be of interest to repeat such surveys at five-year intervals for the purpose of noting any changes in general trends.

Seymour G. Klebanoff, Ph.D.

